

C. J. Torrey.

June 12, 1838

For The Liberator

PHELPS  
MSS.

Friend Garrison,

51

I wish to correct an error in the printing of our brief protest against the decision of the Convention, inviting both sexes to participate alike in all the exercises of the Convention. The sentence, "inviting women to vote, debate, and aid it, should read, "vote, debate and act generally etc."

This accidental misprint makes us ~~appear~~ <sup>seem</sup> to father a sentiment, which we all abhor.

The action to which we object, is confined to those things which are the appropriate duties of a member of such a Convention.

We are far from objecting to any meetings for any purpose, which our Sisters are disposed to hold by themselves; or to their aiding in all proper ways, the cause of truth and freedom.

You will notice, that though the signers may individually believe that it is sinful for a woman to speak in the public assembly, they do not base their protest on that ground. They object only to identifying the question of woman's rights & wrongs, with the cause of the slave, by the aid of a Convention of men who differ on that and almost every other subject, except, the moral character, and proper remedy for slaveholding. We



consider it a violation of that good faith so often pledged to each other, that we would not introduce our private religious or political opinions, as tests of our adherence to the cause of the slave. It is a renewal of the "Clerical appeal" ~~movement~~ <sup>affair</sup>, only this time the departure from anti-slavery principles comes from the other side, viz. from those who were loudest in their condemnation of that ill-judged movement.

From a remark made by one of the Secretaries in relation to those who directed that their names should be stricken from the roll of the convention, it might be inferred that but few agreed with them in sentiment on this subject. This ~~is~~ is a very great mistake, as we have ample evidence. From the lateness of the hour we had no time to get the names of one half of those then <sup>re</sup>present on the stage, who would have joined in the protest, as we have since learned, had opportunity been given. More than three fourths of the convention had already left, including many of our most efficient friends, who agreed with the 'protestants'. Besides, a protest from a few, answered all the purpose of breaking the force of the proceeding as a precedent to



guide the action of future Conventions. The  
fact to which you allude, as one worthy of  
very special remark, that the signers of  
the protest are chiefly Congregational  
clergymen, is readily explained by what has  
already been alluded to. We had no time to  
ask any to sign but those right around  
us, whose faces and views were previously  
known to Br Phelps and myself. It is not  
true that orthodox men were the only ones  
who objected to the whole proceeding. Not  
a few Unitarians, and Friends, and those  
among the first and most faithful men in  
our ranks condemned the action of the  
convention; tho' some thought it should  
have been resisted at the outset, and that  
it was too late to retract a wrong step then  
so near the close of the convention. One thing  
is no doubt true: that is, that most of those  
who are conscientiously opposed to females  
taking part in promiscuous meetings, are  
(so called) orthodox men, and to a great extent,  
in New England at least, Congregationalists.

yours only, for the Slave,

Charles T. Torrey.

Salem June 12<sup>th</sup> 1838



(cl. Box 83. Gentle)

PAID 12  
Rev. A. Phelps,  
Boston,  
Mass